DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 938 UD 026 166

AUTHOR Lunenburg, Frederick C.; Schmidt, Linda J.
TITLE Pupil Control Ideology and Behavior and the Quality of School Life.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Discipline; Educational Environment; *Educational Experience; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Humanistic Education; *Ideology; *Student Attitudes; Student Behavior; *Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

More information is needed about the quality of school life, especially as it affects students' attitudes toward school. This paper contrasts pupil control ideologies and the types of school climates they engender in order to determine their effects on the quality of school life. Pupil control ideology and teacher behavior are conceptualized along a continuum that goes from humanistic to custodial. Instruments were administered to 239 elementary and secondary teachers in five school districts (urban, suburban, and rural) in a midwestern state to ascertain their control ideologies. It was found that control ideology and behavior of teachers did have an impact on the quality of school life for students. Custodial classrooms with faculty-student relationships characterized by dominance and subordination, mistrust, conformity, and punitive sanctions had deleterious effects on students' satisfaction with school, their commitment to classwork, and their reactions to teachers. Humanistic classrooms with faculty ideology and behavior marked by acceptance, understanding, trust, flexibility, and attempts to encourage self-discipline resulted in positive attitudes toward school, high commitment to classwork, and positive reactions to teachers. The influence of faculty on students was found to be powerful and pervasive. More humanistic control is needed in the organizational culture of public schools. A list of references and statistical tables are included. (VM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

6-2-88

ED294938

PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND BEHAVIOR AND THE QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE

Frederick C. Lunenburg
University of Louisville

Linda J. Schmidt
Chicago Public Schools

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1988

UD 026 166

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Frederick Lunenburg
Univ. of Louisville
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY AND BEHAVIOR AND THE QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE

Sociologists and educators recently have discussed the merits of using social system and culture dimensions to promote better knowledge of the quality of education (Rutter, 1980; Wilson, 1980). In the past researchers have collected and reported objective and easily measurable organizational attributes such as finances, population and enrollment characteristics, retention and attainment rates, and standardized achievement scores (Duncan, 1968; Mushkin, 1973; U.S. Department of Commerce, 1973). Conspicuously missing from our current understanding of the conditions of education is information on the quality of school life of students (Epstein, 1981).

The concept of Quality of Life, taken from environmental studies of adults (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1973) has been applied to elementary, middle, and high schools by Epstein and McPartland (1976). The construct was developed on the basis of their belief that attitude toward school should be treated as a separate educational outcome, apart from its relationship to academic success. The construct is believed to be "affected by both the informal and formal aspects of school: social and task-related experiences, and the relationships with authority figures and peers" (Epstein & McPartland, 1976, p. 16).

Student's reactions to life in school and their commitment to schoolwork are an important measure of a school's effectiveness; however, there is little research evidence to support claims

regarding the conditions that influence the quality of school life of students. One neglected area of study is the impact of organizational properties of schools on the quality of school life for students. It was the purpose of this investigation to explore the relationship between the control ideology and behavior of teachers, postulated to be an important organizational variable, and its influence on the quality of school life for students.

PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY

Following the lead of earlier research (Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, 1973) on pupil control, the concepts of humanistic and custodial pupil control ideologies were used to contrast types of individual orientations and the types of school organizations that they seek to rationalize and justify. A brief description of each prototype is presented below (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

The model of custodial orientation depicts a classroom atmosphere with a rigid and highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order. Students are stereotyped in terms of their appearance, behavior, and parents' social status. Teachers who hold a custodial orientation conceive of the school as an autocratic organization with a rigid pupil-teacher status hierarchy; the flow of power and communication is unilateral downward. Students must accept the decisions of teachers without question. Student misbehavior is viewed as a personal affront; students are perceived as irresponsible and undisciplined persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions. Impersonality, pessimism, and watchful mistrust imbue the atmosphere of the custodial school.

On the other hand, the model of the humanistic orientation is the school conceived as an educational community in which students learn through cooperative interaction and experience. Learning and behavior are viewed in psychological and sociological terms rather than moralistic ones. Self-discipline is substituted for strict teacher control. The humanistic orientation leads teachers to desire a democratic atmosphere with its attendant flexibility in status and rules, sensitivity to others, open communication, and increased student self-determination. Both teachers and pupils are willing to act on their own volition and to accept responsibility for their actions.

A large number of studies have focused on the relationship between various teacher characteristics and predispositions and pupil control ideology (Willower, 1975, 1977). Only a few previous investigations have examined the relationship between teacher pupil control ideology and student variables. This research has indicated that a custodial orientation is related to student alienation from school (Hoy, 1972), high student absenteeism and suspension rates (McBride, 1972) student unrest (Duggal, 1969), low student self-actualization (Deibert & Hoy, 1977), negative feelings toward teachers (Lunenburg & Stouten, 1983), and low student self-concept as learners (Lunenburg, 1983).

PUPIL CONTROL BEHAVIOR

The concepts of custodialism and humanism provide a way of thinking about educator orientations toward pupil control. These concepts can be employed in terms of ideology or in terms of

behavior. That is, we can speak of an educator whose ideology concerning pupil control is relatively custodial or humanistic, and we can speak of an educator whose controlling behavior is relatively custodial or humanistic. The study of educators' pupil control ideology rather than their pupil control behavior has provided only a partial view of pupil control in school organizations. Ideology may or may not be reflected in behavior (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973, p. 37).

In order to allow a more complete view of pupil control in the school, the construct of pupil control behavior was conceptualized (Helsel & Willower, 1974). This construct is also based on a humanistic-custodial continuum. The concept of pupil control behavior builds upon and is companion to the extensive earlier work on pupil control ideology in educational organizations. Specifically, it represents an attempt to define and measure pupil control behavior using the same theoretical framework that guided the earlier investigations. Prototypes of humanistic and custodial pupil control behaviors will be presented briefly (Helsel & Willower, 1974, p. 119).

Custodial educators strive to maintain a high degree of order among pupils. These educators are impersonal and aloof in their relationships with students and are stringent and unyielding in dealing with them. Threats and punitive sanctions are used as means of control. Custodial educators manifest suspicion and distrust of pupils, often addressing them in an unpleasant or angry manner. These educators react personally and judgementally toward students who misbehave.

Humanistic educators strive to establish a basis of mutual respect and friendship in their relationships with pupils. They are patient, congenial and easily approached by students. These educators are responsive to student suggestions and ideas and encourage pupil self-discipline and independence. They are flexible and tolerant in dealing with students and react toward misbehavior on the basis of efforts to understand it.

A relatively small number of pupil control behavior studies have been completed to date. While the behavioral expression of ideological views may be distorted, it seems reasonable to expect that ideology will, to a degree, be reflected in behavior. In this regard, pupil control ideology and pupil control behavior were significantly related (Helsel & Willower, 1974). This relationship was confirmed for the positions of teacher, counselor, and principal. Subsequently, a relationship between pupil control behavior and dogmatism was confirmed which was mediated by pupil control ideology (Helsel, 1976). The relationship between dogmatism and pupil control ideology was supported in earlier research (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973; Lunenburg & O'Reilly, 1974). Further, a direct relationship was found between teachers' pupil control behavior and student attitudes toward school (Pritchett & Willower, 1975), and the congruence between students' perceived and preferred teacher pupil control behavior was directly related to students' positive attitudes toward teachers and school (Sweeting, Willower, & Helsel, 1978).

QUALITY OF SCHOOL LIFE

Considerable attention has been given to the quality of life of adults (Flanagan, 1975; Katzell & Guzzo, 1983; McFarland, 1975; New York Stock Exchange, 1982; Tuttle, 1983; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1973). While this concept is only vaguely defined, three basic aspects have been discussed at both the individual and societal levels - general feelings of well being, opportunity to fulfill one's potential, and feeling positive social involvement.

Measurement and meaning of the "quality of life" for youngsters, their general satisfaction, or specific reactions to aspects of schooling have not been given attention. One exception is the work of Epstein and McPartland (1976). These researchers used the construct of Quality of School Life to identify schools with a climate of positive effect. Unlike most researchers who use climate as an independent variable, they suggested using it as the outcome variable (Epstein & McPartland, 1976). Three factors are believed to contribute to the Quality of Life in a school. Each of these factors will be discussed briefly below (Epstein & McPartland, 1978).

Satisfaction with School examines students' general reactions to school. Because school is a major part of youngsters' lives, students who are positive in their evaluation of life in school may be more likely to experience feelings of general well-being. They also may be more likely to behave in socially acceptable ways and help other students in the school setting.

Commitment to Classwork deals with the level of student interest in classwork. Tasks and assignments are what makes school different

from non-school settings. In short, "the work" is what makes school school. Students who find class assignments and projects interesting and important may learn facts and concepts more completely, and may develop more positive attitudes toward learning.

Reactions to Teachers examines student evaluations of instructional and personal interactions with teachers. Student-teacher relationships may be the key to student acceptance of educational goals, student understanding of school procedures, differences in students' independent or dependent behavior, and attitudes toward authority in and out of school.

These three dimensions of quality of school life provided the conceptual basis for the study of quality of school life in this research.

RATIONALE AND HYPOTHESES

The objectives of the school as a social institution are to achieve major changes in the child. These changes are not restricted to cognitive behavior (learning) but include a wide range of social, emotional, physical, and, in some cases, moral behavior (Bidwell, 1965). Organizations that achieve or attempt to achieve the most thoroughgoing change are performing functions crucial to the maintenance of social control (Street, Vinter, & Perrow, 1970).

Furthermore, schools accept as conscripted clients all those who legally must attend. That is, neither the organization (school) nor the client (student) exercises choice concerning participation in the relationship (Carlson, 1964). The mandatory nature of the pupil's participation suggests that schools are of necessity dealing

with clients whose motivations and desires for the school's services cannot be assumed. It seems reasonable that pupil control would be a major concern.

Educators and social researchers are increasingly becoming aware that establishing positive student reactions to school life is an important objective for schools (Jackson, 1968; Jencks, et al., 1972; Silberman, 1970). Positive reactions to school may increase the likelihood that students will stay in school, develop a lasting commitment to learning, and use the school setting to advantage. At least, higher satisfaction with school, greater commitment to school work, and more positive student-teacher relationships mean more enjoyable and stimulating hours spent in the compulsory school setting.

Given the importance of pupil control in public schools, the conceptualization of the pupil control ideology and behavior of teachers along a humanistic-custodial continuum seemed useful in the analysis of the quality of school life for students. Pupil control was thought to be a pervasive facet of the organizational culture of schools that has an impact on the quality of school life. We theorized that teachers characterized by humanistic pupil control ideology and behavior should foster higher student satisfaction with school, greater student commitment to classwork, and more positive student-teacher relationships. In contrast, custodial pupil control ideology and behavior in classrooms should result in more negative reactions to these factors and a lower quality of school life for students.

Accordingly, the following set of related hypothesis were formulated and guided the study:

H.1. The more custodial the pupil control ideology of the teacher, the more unfavorable the students' attitude toward the quality of school life.

1.a The more custodial the pupil control ideology of the teacher, the lower the students' satisfaction with school in general.

1.b The more custodial the pupil control ideology of the teacher, the lower the students' commitment to classwork.

1.c The more custodial the pupil control ideology of the teacher, the more negative the students' reactions to teachers.

H.2. The more custodial the pupil control behavior of the teacher, the more unfavorable the students' attitude toward the quality of school life.

2.a The more custodial the pupil control behavior of the teacher, the lower the students' satisfaction with school in general.

2.b The more custodial the pupil control behavior of the teacher, the lower the students' commitment to classwork.

2.c The more custodial the pupil control behavior of the teacher, the more negative the students' reactions to teachers.

PROCEDURES

To test these hypothesis, operational measures of pupil control ideology, pupil control behavior, and the various dimensions of quality of school life were necessary.

Instruments

The measurement instruments selected were those frequently used in previous research to operationally define the constructs investigated in this study. An attempt was made to select those instruments with demonstrated psychometric properties. The Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973) operationally defines faculty orientations toward the control of students. The Pupil Control Behavior (PCB) form (Helsel & Willower, 1974), a companion instrument, operationally defines the pupil control behavior of faculty as viewed by students. Student perceptions of the quality of the school and classroom environment were operationally defined by the Quality of School Life (QSL) scale (Epstein & McPartland, 1976).

Pupil Control Ideology. The Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI) was the instrument used to measure the extent to which the pupil control ideology of educators was custodial or humanistic; it consists of twenty Likert-type items. Examples of items are: "Beginning teachers are not likely to maintain strict enough control over their pupils," "Pupils can be trusted to work together without supervision," and "It is often necessary to remind pupils that their status in schools differs from that of teachers." Responses are

made on a 5-point scale in a "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" format. The scoring range is 20 to 100, the higher the score the more custodial the ideology. Corrected split-half reliabilities of .91 and .95 were reported for this instrument, and it discriminated between teachers and schools judged to be custodial or humanistic (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973).

Pupil Control Behavior. The Pupil Control Behavior Form (PCB) is a 20-item Likert-type device which measures an educator's pupil control behavior along a custodial-humanistic continuum. Examples of items, prefaced by the words "my teacher," are "Is cheerful and pleasant with students," and "Gets angry with students." Responses to each item range over five choices from "always" to "never." The instrument is completed by students, and the score of a given teacher is the mean of the scores of the responding students in that teacher's class. The possible score range is from 20 to 100. Higher scores indicate more custodial pupil control behavior, while lower scores indicate more humanistic behavior. The reported reliability of the PCB Form was .92 as estimated by Cronbach's alpha. Item-scale correlations for the instrument averaged .81, and a one-way analysis of variance indicated that the measure differentiated among subjects while clustering within subjects (Helsel & Willower, 1974).

Quality of School Life. The Quality of School Life Scale (QSL) is a standardized 27-item forced-choice, multidimensional measure of three basic aspects of the quality of school life. The initial validation study (Epstein & McPartland, 1976) indicated the existence of three factors: satisfaction with school (SAT),

commitment to classwork (COM), and reactions to teachers (TCH). The first factor consists of five items, and the other two factors include eleven items each. Items use positive and negative statements and several response patterns to minimize response set. Examples of items include the following: "I like school very much" (SAT); "Work in class is just busy work and a waste of time" (COM); and "I feel I can go to my teacher with the things that are on my mind" (TCH). Responses to the questionnaire are scored so as to yield measures on each of the three quality of school life factors; and the sum of the factor scores represents a global measure of the quality of school life. Substantial evidence as to the validity of the QSL Scale has been reported. The overall Kuder-Richardson reliability for the QSL is .87 and .89 for secondary and elementary students (N = 4266), respectively. For the subtests, reliability coefficients range from .79 to .81 for the SAT subscale, .72 to .80 for the COM subscale, and .64 to .73 for the TCH subscale (Epstein & McPartland, 1978).

SAMPLE

The sample for the study consisted of 239 elementary and secondary teachers and their students from two elementary and four secondary schools in five school districts in a midwestern state. The schools were distributed among urban, suburban, and rural areas; and they varied widely in size, community wealth, racial mix, and degree of industrialization. The size of the schools ranged from 468 to over 3000 students with a mean of 1098 students. Two of the secondary schools were located in a large metropolitan city.

Another high school and one elementary school were from its suburbs. The two remaining schools, one elementary and one secondary school, were located in another area of the same state and could be described as "rural-small town." Furthermore, the sample represented a diverse group of educators with respect to age, race, gender, experience, and educational level. The student sample also exhibited variation with respect to grade level, racial composition, gender, and socioeconomic status.

After the schools were selected, trained researchers personally collected data from both faculty and students in each school. PCI data were obtained from virtually the entire upper grade level elementary faculty and the entire secondary faculty in each school. However, only teachers who taught major subjects that met five periods per week were asked to participate. Each of the 239 teachers, 49 elementary and 190 secondary teachers, completed PCI Forms and personal data sheets. Similarly, PCB and QSL data were collected from one class taught by each of these teachers by a researcher during regularly scheduled classes. In elementary schools fifth through eighth grade classes were selected by the throw of a die for each grade level. In high schools ninth through twelfth grade students were chosen by the throw of a die for each grade level. All of the students selected in this manner, except for a few students, completed the forms which were reverse ordered in approximately half of the classes. A total of 5,172 students furnished usable PCB Forms and 5,199 students completed usable QSL Scales, for an average of 26 students per classroom. In all, more than 5000 faculty and students in 239 classes returned usable questionnaires.

RESULTS

The study hypotheses were tested using the classroom as the unit of analysis. Correlation analysis was used to test the hypotheses. Hypothesis one was tested by correlating PCI and QSL scores, as well as each of the subtests of the QSL. The PCI scores for each teacher were correlated with the mean QSL and subscale scores for each classroom. Hypothesis two was tested by correlating PCB scores and QSL scores, as well as each of the dimensions of QSL. The PCB scores for each teacher were correlated with the mean QSL and subscale scores for each classroom.

The correlation computed to assess the first hypothesis was -.17, which with 237 degrees of freedom, was significant at the .01 level. Separate coefficients of correlation were computed between teacher PCI and each of the three dimensions of the QSL. For the sample of 239 teachers and classrooms, the coefficients were -.16 for satisfaction with school, -.26 for commitment to classwork, and -.13 for reactions to teachers. Two were significant at the .01 level and one was significant at the .05 level. Thus, custodial PCI was associated with unfavorable quality of school life. And the hypothesized relationships were supported for each of the dimensions of QSL as predicted in the sub-hypotheses. The more custodial the classroom, the lower the student's satisfaction with school and commitment to classwork and the more negative were the students' reactions to their teachers. However, the correlation coefficients were very low and the variance (r^2) accounted for is slight, 7% even in the case of test hypothesis 1(b) which yielded the highest correlation coefficient obtained.

The test of the second hypothesis yielded a correlation of -.76. With 237 degrees of freedom, this was significant beyond the .001 level. Separate examinations of the relationships between PCB and the three dimensions of QSL, satisfaction with school, commitment to classwork, and reactions to teachers, yielded correlations of -.59, -.56, and -.79 respectively, all significant at the .001 level. Thus, the second major hypothesis of the study was confirmed. Custodial PCB was associated with unfavorable quality of school life. This hypothesis was supported for each of the variants of QSL as predicted in the sub-hypotheses. It should be noted that the negative correlations reported throughout were a function of the scaling of the PCI, PCB, and QSL variables, where increasing PCI and PCB were associated with decreasing QSL values. Pearson Product-moment coefficient of correlations are reported in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

In addition to the tests made of the hypotheses, a multiple regression analysis was performed using forward, stepwise inclusion procedures. Standard use of stepwise regression was employed. That is, the first predictor variable added was the one that correlated highest with the criterion; the next variable added was the one that, in concert with the first, best predicted the criterion, and so on. Each successive predictor variable that was added was the

variable which had the highest partial correlations with the criterion variable partialed on the predictors already in the equation. No hierarchical inclusion criteria were established for the entry of any of the independent variables.

Nine predictor variables were regressed against QSL. They were the two pupil control scores and several demographic characteristics such as teaching experience, age, class size, education level, gender, type of school (elementary or secondary), and school locale (urban, suburban, rural). Gender and school level, dichotomous variables, were entered even though their inclusion technically violated the convention of multiple regression that data be of the interval type.

The first predictor variable to enter the regression equation was pupil control behavior. The QSL/pupil control behavior correlation was moderately high in magnitude ($R = .761$, $< .001$), and accounted for approximately 58 percent of the QSL variance. At step two, the next variable to enter the regression equation was school locale (urban, suburban, rural), which when combined with the PCB variable, served to increase the multiple correlation to .812, and the amount of predictor/QSL shared variance to approximately 66 percent. Though not of great practical importance, successive amounts of QSL variance were accounted for through step three by the addition of experience, increasing the multiple correlation to .819, and the amount of common QSL/predictor variance to approximately 67 percent.

The results in table 2 indicate that students' perceptions of the quality of school life are largely explained by the pupil control behavior of faculty in combination with school locale and

teaching experience. It is interesting to note that the inclusion of all nine predictor variables in the regression equation served to increase the multiple correlation to only .822, and the amount of explained QSL/predictor variance to approximately 68 percent, but PCB alone accounted for 58 percent of it. Clearly, PCB was the single best predictor of quality of school life.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

In another series of analyses, mean scores on PCI, PCB, and QSL were compared within various demographic categories. Few significant findings emerged. Most notable, however, were the relationships between the three major variables of the study and school locale (urban, suburban, rural). Two schools with a total of 112 faculty members were in a region classified as urban. Two schools with 66 faculty members were in an area classified as suburban. And two schools with 61 faculty members were in a region classified as rural. All three variables, PCI, PCB, and QSL, were significantly related to school locale (urban, suburban, rural). The pupil control ideology of faculty was more custodial in urban schools ($F = 5.39$, $p < .01$) then in suburban or rural schools; the pupil control behavior of faculty was more custodial in urban schools ($F = 7.20$, $p < .001$) than in other school locales; and student perceptions of the quality of school life was more negative

in urban schools ($F = 9.39$, $p < .001$) than in suburban or rural schools. Class size, type of school, and faculty gender, age, and education level were not related to any of the three major variables of the study.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study support the rationale that undergirded the investigation. It was theorized that the control ideology and behavior of faculty would have an impact on the quality of school life for students. Custodial classrooms with faculty-student relationships characterized by dominance and subordination, mistrust, order, conformity, and the use of threats and punitive sanctions were postulated to have deleterious effects on students' satisfaction with school, their commitment to classwork, and their reactions to teachers. On the contrary, the humanistic classroom with faculty ideology and accompanying behavior marked by acceptance, understanding, trust, flexibility, and attempts to encourage student self-discipline seemed likely to result in positive attitudes toward school, high commitment to classwork, and positive reactions to teachers.

The results of the research support the theory. The more humanistic (less custodial) the control ideology of the faculty, the more positive the quality of school life for students in terms of attitudes toward school and commitment to classwork and teachers. And the more humanistic (less custodial) the control behavior of faculty, the more negative the perceptions of students' overall school experiences regarding social, task, and authority measures of the school and classroom environment.

As noted previously, the relationship between quality of school life and pupil control behavior was considerably stronger than the relationship with pupil control ideology. One might expect a moderately high correspondence between role ideology and role behavior with respect to pupil control. Schools are formal organizations characterized by structural looseness (Bidwell, 1965; Weick, 1976). This characteristic tends to broaden the limits of individual discretion and performance. School faculty perform alone within the classroom, relatively hidden from colleagues and superiors. This role performance invisibility tends to increase the congruency between behavior and ideology. However, at the same time, a reality factor may operate within the relative isolation of the classroom so that faculty control behavior of varying types may be called for by specific classroom circumstances, and at such times faculty control behavior is relatively independent of control ideology. That is, individuals may not act in accordance with their beliefs. Moreover, in formal organizations, such as schools, social system pressures as well as intrapersonal processes outside of the classroom, such as rules, norms, role expectations, and sanctions, probably intervene to reduce congruency between ideology and behavior.

While it should be noted that these ideas are speculations not conclusions, two companion studies of environmental robustness, one using an elementary school sample (Multhauf, Willower, & Licata, 1978) and the other a secondary school sample (Estep, Willower, & Licata, 1980) found that PCB was a stronger predictor of that construct than PCI. A third investigation found that principal PCB

was a solid predictor of environmental robustness in elementary and secondary schools (Smedley & Willower, 1981).

While pupil control styles tapped only one facet of the teaching-learning environment within schools, it was thought to be a pervasive one that would have an impact upon a range of relationships and attitudes, including the social aspects of the school (SAT), the task structure of the school (COM), and the authority structure of the school (TCH). Similarly, quality of school life obviously is affected by both internal and external factors that go beyond control ideology and behavior; nevertheless, social system and organizational culture considerations suggested that the variables treated in the hypotheses might be key ones in shaping students' attitudes toward the school and classroom environment.

In this regard, faculty PCB accounted for approximately 58 percent of the variance in QSL. This indicates that, at least in this study, teachers made a difference in the school culture as perceived by students. There were other variables that also had an impact, including school locale and teaching experience, but, clearly, PCB was the single best predictor of quality of school life. Further, variables like peer relationships, participation in activities, school grades, standardized achievement, teaching styles, and college and occupational plans, which were not examined in this research, are probably no less important influences on students' perceptions of the quality of the school and classroom environment.

It was found that urban schools were perceived to be more custodial in both control ideology and behavior than suburban or rural schools. In addition, students' perceptions of the quality of school life in urban schools were more negative than their perceptions of the quality of school life in suburban or rural schools. These differences should be interpreted with caution. Results could have been influenced by school size and school level (elementary or secondary). The two schools which were classified as urban were the largest secondary schools in the sample. The two schools classed as rural were the smallest schools in the sample and consisted of one elementary school and one secondary school. The remaining two schools, classified as suburban, included one elementary and one secondary school in the medium-sized range when compared with the schools in the other two categories.

Notwithstanding these caveats, there is some support for the relationships between the major variables of the study and school locale. Crozier (1964) hypothesized that an educational institution mirrors the cultural values and traditions characteristic of the social system of its society, and a study in Paraguay (Stimpson & LaBelle, 1971) supports this hypothesis. Moreover, urban schools get more custodial teachers (Campbell & Williamson, 1978), and teachers become socialized into the organizational culture of the school concerning pupil control (Hoy, 1968, 1969; Lunenburg, 1986); that is, experienced teachers influence the pupil control styles of beginning teachers coming into the system. Further inquiry might determine whether differences in school locale are related to cultural factors, population density, socioeconomic status, per pupil expenditure, amount of community involvement, and the degree of centralization of the school system.

Since students spend so much time in a school setting, it is important that school administrators learn as much as possible about the effects that this environment has on all of its inhabitants, not the least important of which are its clients--the students. Researchers, faculty, and administrators must ask, "Does what we do in school make a difference to the students? Few research studies look at the relative strength of teacher influence solely within the school context, other than in association with academic success. While schools define multiple goals (Bidwell, 1965), academic success is the only goal that is regularly measured. This restricted emphasis has been challenged (Jackson, 1968; Jencks, et al., 1972; Silberman, 1970). The findings of this study were that influence of faculty on student attitudes toward school was powerful and pervasive, at least in one facet of the teaching-learning environment, that of control ideology and behavior. The results show that the more humanistic the control ideology and behavior of faculty, the more positive the quality of school life for students; and the more custodial the faculty, the more negative the quality of school life for students. This finding takes on added significance since several studies (Epstein, 1981) have demonstrated an association between positive quality of school life and high student achievement in elementary and secondary schools. Pupil control remains a key facet of the organizational culture of public schools.

REFERENCES

Bidwell, C. (1965). The school as a formal organization. In J. G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations (pp. 972-1022). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Campbell, L., & Williamson, J. (1978). Inner-city schools get more custodial teachers. The Clearing House, 52, 140-141.

Carlson, R. (1964). Environmental constraints and organizational consequences: The public school and its clients. In D. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration (pp. 262-272). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crozier, M. (1964). The bureaucratic phenomenon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Deibert, J., & Hoy, W. (1977). Custodial high schools and self-actualization of students. Educational Research Quarterly, 2, 24-31.

Duggal, S. P. (1969). Relationship between student unrest, student participation in school management, and dogmatism and pupil control ideology. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Duncan, B. (1968). Trends in output and distribution of schooling. In E. B. Sheldon & W. E. Moore (Eds.), Indicators of social change: Concepts and measurements. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Epstein, J. L. (1981). The quality of school life. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company.

Epstein, J. L., & McPartland, J. M. (1976). The concept and measurement of the quality of school life. American Educational Research Journal, 13, 15-30.

Epstein, J. L., & McPartland, J. M. (1978). Quality of school life administration and technical manual. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Estep, L. E., Willower, D. J., & Licata, J. W. (1980). Teacher pupil control ideology and behavior as predictors of classroom robustness. High School Journal, 63, 155-159.

Flanagan, J. C. (1975). Education's contribution to the quality of life of a national sample of 30 year-olds. Educational Researcher, 4, 13-16.

Helsel, A. R., & Willower, D. J. (1974). Toward definition and measurement of pupil control behavior. Journal of Educational Administration, 12, 114-12.

Helsel, A. R. (1976). Personality and pupil control behavior. Journal of Educational Administration, 14, 79-86.

Hoy, W.K. (1968). The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 76, 312-323.

Hoy, W.K. (1969). A further examination of the influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 77, 257-265.

Hoy, W. K. (1972). Dimensions of student alienation and characteristics of public high schools. Interchange, 3, 38-51.

Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1987). Educational administration: Theory, research and practice, 3rd ed. New York: Random House.

Jackson, P. (1968). Life in classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.

Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). Inequality. New York: Basic Books.

Katzell, R. A., & Guzzo, R. A. (1983). Psychological approaches to productivity improvement. American Psychologist, 38, 418-472.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1983). Pupil control ideology and self-concept as a learner. Educational Research Quarterly, 8, 33-39.

Lunenburg, F. C., & O'Reilly, R. R. (1974). Personal and organizational influence on pupil control ideology. Journal of Experimental Education, 42, 31-35.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Stouten, J. W. (1983). Teacher pupil control ideology and pupils projected feelings toward teachers. Psychology in the Schools, 20, 528-533.

Lunenburg, F.C. (1986). The influence of experience on the student teacher. High School Journal, 69, 214-217.

McBride, A. P. (1972). A comparative study of a group of New Jersey middle schools and junior high schools in relation to their pupil control ideology and selected pupil behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University.

McFarland, D. D. (1975). Models involving social indicators of population and the quality of life. In K. C. Lind & S. Spilerman (Eds.), Social indicator models. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Multhauf, A. P., Willower, D. J., & Licata, J. W. (1978). Teacher pupil control ideology and behavior and classroom environmental robustness. Elementary School Journal, 79, 41-46.

Mushkin, S. (1973). National assessment and social indicators. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics.

New York Stock Exchange. (1982). People and productivity: A challenge to corporate America. New York: Author, Office of Economic Research.

Pritchett, W., & Willower, D. J. (1975). Student perceptions of teacher pupil control behavior and student attitudes toward high school. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 21, 110-115.

Rutter, M. (1980). School influences on children's behavior and development. Pediatrics, 65, 208-220.

Silberman, C. E. (1970). Crisis in the classroom. New York: Random House.

Stimson, J., & LaBelle, T. J. (1971). The organizational climate of Paraguayan elementary schools: Rural-urban differentiation. Education and Urban Society, 3, 333-349.

Street, D., Vinter, R., & Perrow, C. (1970). Organization for treatment. New York: Random House.

Smedley, S. R., & Willower, D. J. (1981). Principals' pupil control behavior and school robustness. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17, 40-56.

Sweeting, L. M., Willower, D. J., & Helsel, A. R. (1978). Teacher-pupil relationships: Black students' perceptions of actual and ideal teacher/pupil control behavior and attitudes toward teachers and school. Urban Education, 13, 71-81.

Tuttle, T. C. (1983). Organization productivity: A challenge for psychologists. American Psychologist, 38, 479-486.

U.S. Department of Commerce. (1973). Social indicators. Office of Management and Budget, Statistical Policy Division, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (1973). The quality of life concept: A potential new tool for decision-makers. Office of Research and Monitoring, Environmental Studies Division.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Willower, D. J. (1975). Some comments on inquiries on schools and pupil control. Teachers College Record, 77, 219-230.

Willower, D. J. (1977). Schools and pupil control. In D. A. Erickson (Ed.), Educational Organization and Administration (pp. 296-310). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1973). The school and pupil control ideology (Penn State Studies Monograph No. 24). University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Wilson, A. (1980). Landmarks in the literature: How powerful is schooling? New York University Education Quarterly, 11, 28-31.

TABLE 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations for Pupil Control Ideology, Pupil Control Behavior, Quality of School Life, and the QSL Subscales

	PCI	PCB	QSL	SAT	COM	TCH
PCI	1.00					
PCB	.17**	1.00				
QSL	-.17**	-.76***	1.00			
SAT	-.16**	-.59***	.63***	1.00		
COM	-.26***	-.56***	.69***	.36***	1.00	
TCH	-.13*	-.79***	.68***	.29***	.34***	1.00
Mean	57.49	53.17	12.57	2.02	4.92	5.49
S.D.	10.28	9.37	4.23	1.24	2.15	1.96

N = 239, df = 237, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p > .001.

TABLE 2

Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of Selected Variables on Quality of School Life (n = 239)

Regression Step	R	R^2	F	p
1. Pupil Control Behavior	.761	.578	182.88	.001
2. School Locale	.812	.659	24.66	.001
3. Experience	.819	.670	7.49	.001